New Car Acquisition Survey

(Continued from page 10)

Three fleets will specify that 1986 models are equipped with standard transmissions, two only in compacts and one in all its new cars.

Six fleets in the group report they will be ordering some specialty cars in 1986, a total of 90 units. Two fleets plan to acquire a few compacts during the coming model year, while four fleets already have some imports in service, about 50 units all together.

Twenty-seven of the 34 fleets give the company-car operator a voice in fleet car selection. Twenty-six permit a choice of car make; 17 allow a choice of the model desired. Four fleets permit a choice of engine and three allow the operator to select the transmission desired. Nineteen fleets permit the operator to purchase optional equipment items.

"The Financial Group's planned acquisitions are: two percent will be sub-compacts; 22 percent compacts; 69 percent mid-size, and seven percent large cars."

Financial Group

A new group appearing in this year's survey consists of 13 banks and financial institutions. They operate a total of 1,907 cars (1,197 owned, 710 leased). The current composition of this group is two percent sub-compacts; 17 percent compacts; 68 percent mid-size, and 13 percent large cars.

During the 1985 model year, these fleets acquired 649 new cars; they plan to buy or lease 607 in the 1986 model year. Of their planned acquisitions, two percent will be sub-compacts; 22 percent compacts; 69 percent mid-size cars, and seven percent large cars.

Eighty-one percent of the planned acquisitions will be four-door sedans; 12 percent two-door sedans. Three percent of the orders will be for station wagons, and two percent each for vans and five-door hatchbacks.

Seventy-eight percent of the new car orders will be for middle line models; 16 percent bottom line units, and six percent for top of the line cars.

Three fleets will order some specialty cars in 1986. One fleet is planning to acquire one imported car, while four fleets now have a total of 10 imports in service.

Two fleets in the Financial Group are planning major changes in their engine specifications, one will order turbo charged engines for its mid-size cars, the other plans to use four-cylinder engines in its mid-size units. One fleet will order all 1986 models with standard transmission.

At the present time, this group follows the usual practice of equipping compacts with four-cylinder engines; mid-size cars with sixes, and large cars with eights.

Ten of the 13 fleets in the group give the company-car operator a choice in vehicle selection.

(Continued on page 14)

New Car Orders By Body Style — U.S. Fleets
U.S. Commercial Fleets
(Percentage of New Car Orders)

3-door hatchback	1%
5-door hatchback	2%
Station Wagon	9%
2-door Sedan	6%
4-door Sedan	79%
Sport Model	*
Van	3%

*Mentioned, but less than ½ of 1%.

U.S. Commercial Summary

Group	Number of Cars	Current Composition: Owned	Leased	Sub-Compact	Compact	Mid-Size	Large	1985 New Car Acquisitions	1986 Planned New Car Acquisitions	Sub-Compact	Compact	Mid-Size	Large
Drug & Cosmetics (26)	18,921	2,441	16,480	300	1,843	15,901	877	7,696	7,788	150	669	6,663	306
Food & Beverage (21)	14,979	9,197	5,782	2	3,495	10,722	760	6,588	6,647	—	1,495	4,923	229
Chemical & Petroleum (31)	18,434	8,890	9,544	120	827	11,137	6,275	5,316	6,527	40	595	4,004	1,888
Insurance (32)	32,860	19,082	13,778	388	19,109	11,852	1,188	10,412	11,030	169	5,778	4,481	305
Manufacturing—Consumer (34)	22,533	14,388	8,145	30	3,102	17,030	1,621	8,602	8,698	3	680	7,494	271
Manufacturing—Industrial (34)	37,644	11,112	26,532	4	14,524	21,612	1,504	13,578	13,819	—	4,796	8,739	284
Financial (13)	1,907	1,197	710	42	318	1,295	252	649	607	10	135	420	42
Totals (191)	147,278	66,307	80,971	886	43,218	89,549	12,477	52,841	55,116	372	14,148	36,724	3,325

*Totals may differ for the sub-compact, mid-size, and large current and planned acquisitions because not everyone answered this section of the questionnaire.

New Car Acquisition Survey

(Continued from page 12)

Every fleet giving this choice permits the operator to select the make of car desired; six allow a choice of model. Three fleets permit choice of engine and two allow a choice of transmission. Only three of the 13 fleets permit the operator to add optional equipment items to the standard vehicle specifications.

●

Canadian Segment

The Canadian segment of the new car survey consists of 19 fleets operating 3,940 passenger cars (132 company-owned, 3,808 leased). The current composition of these fleets is 25 percent compacts; 62 percent mid-size, and 13 percent large cars.

During the 1985 model year these fleets acquired 1,315 new cars. Their plans for 1986 call for buying or leasing 1,349 new cars. Twenty-six percent of the new car orders will be for compacts, 69 percent, mid-size, and five percent large cars. One Canadian fleet plans a major change in its new car specifications for 1986. It is switching to minivans.

Seventy-one percent of the Canadian fleet new car orders will be for four-door sedans; nine percent vans; seven percent two-door sedans; five percent five-door hatchbacks; four percent station wagons, three percent sport models, and one percent three-door hatchbacks.

Seventy-five percent of the orders will be for middle line models; 24 percent for top of the line cars, and only one percent for bottom line models.

Three fleets in the Canadian Group plan to acquire some specialty cars in 1986. Three other fleets will acquire a handful of imports, while seven of the 19 fleets in the group report they already have some imports in service, a total of 51 vehicles.

"The Canadian fleet cars are well equipped vehicles. Among the 10 fleets ordering large cars, standard equipment includes air conditioning in nine fleets..."

In engine use, the Canadian fleets follow the same pattern as the U.S. fleets — four cylinders in compacts; six cylinders in mid-size, and eights in the large cars.

Only one Canadian fleet plans a major change in its engine specifications for 1986; it is switching to a four-cylinder engine in mid-size cars.

Fifteen of the 19 fleets have a policy of giving the car operator a choice in vehicle selection. All 15 allow a choice of the make of car; 14 permit choice of model. Four allow the driver to select the car's engine; two allow choice of transmission. Twelve fleets permit the employee to add optional equipment items to the company's specifications.

The Canadian fleet cars are well equipped vehicles. Among the 10 fleets ordering large cars, standard equipment includes air conditioning in nine fleets, along with AM-FM stereo in seven fleets; cruise control in six, power door locks and power windows in five, and tilt steering wheels in four.

Eleven of the 16 fleets with mid-size cars order all units with stereo; 13 fleets have air conditioning as standard equipment on all units, and eight specify cruise control.

Fourteen fleets will order compact cars in 1986. Eleven will order air conditioning on all units; seven will specify AM-FM stereo, and four will order cruise control for their compacts.

(Continued on page 16)

Survey Totals

FLEETS:	243
U.S. Commercial	191
Public Utility	15
Government	18
Canada	19
TOTAL CARS	173,298
1985 Acquisitions	57,696
1986 Planned Acquisitions	60,412

Autos and trucks delivered to or from anywhere coast-to-coast

Servicing all the major leasing, commercial and private companies since 1959.

TORONTO DRIVEAWAY SERVICE

(Nationwide) Inc.

When you're talking driveaway service in Canada, it's
Toronto Driveaway Service
(Nationwide) Inc.
5803 Yonge St., Suite 101
Willowdale, Ontario, Canada M2M 3V5

Contact: ***Ron Coady***
President and General Manager

(416) 225-7754

Canada's Original Nationwide Auto Delivery System

Options as Standard Equipment

For many years fleet cars in all size categories have been well equipped — almost all fleets order all cars with air conditioning, automatic transmission, power disc brakes, and power steering. In this year's survey, three additional items of optional equipment are being ordered by more fleets than ever before.

Of 105 fleets ordering some large cars, 93 are equipping all units with AM-FM stereo radios; 81 are ordering all cars with cruise control, and 69 are equipping them with tilt steering wheel.

In the survey 166 fleets are planning to order mid-size cars. Of the 166, 131 will specify AM-FM stereo, 114 are ordering cruise control on all units, and 66 are equipping cars with tilt steering wheel.

Seventy-nine fleets plan to order compact cars during the 1986 model year. AM-FM stereo will be standard equipment for 60 of these fleets' compact cars. Forty fleets are equipping all units with cruise control, while 20 are specifying tilt steering wheel.

Among the 15 fleets acquiring subcompacts, 11 are ordering them with AM-FM stereo, five with cruise control, and three with tilt steering wheel.

Summary of Options

U.S. Commercial Fleet

Group	AM/FM Stereo	Power Disc Brakes	Power Steering	Automatic Trans.	S/B/R Tires	Air Cond.	Tinted Glass	Vinyl Roof	Tilt Wheel	Power Door Locks	Power Windows	Cruise Control
Drug & Cosmetics												
Large(14)	12	*	*	*	13	13	13	4	8	8	7	9
Mid-Size (26)	22	25	26	26	26	26	25	3	7	3	2	13
Compact (10)	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	1	3	1	1	6
Sub-Compact (2)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	—	—	—	1
Food & Beverage												
Large (13)	12	*	*	*	12	11	11	4	9	7	7	11
Mid-Size (21)	13	21	21	21	20	21	20	2	11	—	—	15
Compact (8)	3	8	8	8	8	8	8	—	1	—	—	3
Sub-Compact (—)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Insurance												
Large (16)	16	*	*	*	15	16	16	5	13	8	7	13
Mid-Size (23)	16	21	22	22	21	22	21	1	10	1	2	13
Compact (16)	13	16	16	16	15	15	13	—	5	—	—	7
Sub-Compact (5)	3	5	5	5	5	5	3	—	1	—	—	1
Manufacturing-Industrial												
Large (16)	14	*	*	*	15	16	16	8	8	9	9	13
Mid-Size (31)	24	31	31	30	30	31	31	3	13	5	2	23
Compact (14)	9	14	14	13	12	14	14	2	2	—	—	7
Sub-Compact (2)	—	2	2	2	2	2	2	—	1	—	—	2
Manufacturing-Consumer												
Large (18)	18	*	*	*	17	17	17	8	13	12	12	16
Mid-Size (32)	28	31	32	31	31	32	31	5	15	9	5	25
Compact (18)	15	18	18	17	17	18	18	2	7	3	1	12
Sub-Compact (2)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	—	1	—	—	1
Chemical & Petroleum												
Large (21)	15	*	*	*	16	21	20	6	12	9	8	18
Mid-Size (24)	17	23	23	22	17	24	24	—	9	5	—	17
Compact (5)	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	—	2	1	—	3
Sub-Compact (1)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—
Financial												
Large (7)	6	*	*	*	6	7	7	4	6	4	5	6
Mid-Size (9)	6	8	9	9	8	9	9	—	1	2	2	5
Compact (8)	5	7	8	8	6	8	7	—	—	—	—	2
Sub-Compact (3)	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	—	—	—	—	1

NOTE: The figure in ( ) beside the car size indicates the number of fleets in each group ordering that size car. The number under the items of equipment is the number of fleets in each group ordering the item for every car of that size at no expense to the operator.

* Standard equipment on large cars.

Ohio Belt Use Surveys Show:

Drivers Who Don't Buckle Up Put Comfort Before Personal Safety

Statistics show that seat belts save lives, yet there are many people who don't buckle up because they feel seat belts are "uncomfortable, restrictive, get in the way, or wrinkle their clothing," according to surveys conducted over the past four years by the Ohio State Highway Patrol.

The following article, reprinted with permission from Traffic Safety, a publication of the National Safety Council, describes the aims and results of the patrol's extensive research.

If you asked them directly, not many people would say they would rather smash their heads than wrinkle their clothing, but when it comes to deciding whether to wear safety belts while traveling in an automobile, a surprisingly large number of people make just such a choice: they place personal comfort above personal safety. In fact, more than half the people who decide not to use belts do so, not because they don't believe in the safety they provide, but because they feel they are uncomfortable, restrictive, get in the way, or wrinkle their clothing.

"Usage rates were highest among persons who required assistance from officers, such as disabled motorists or drivers asking directions."

This was one of the surprising findings of a series of statewide surveys conducted over the past four years by the Ohio State Highway Patrol.

Finding out why motorists don't buckle up is naturally of interest to the patrol, which has supported safety belt use ever since the devices became readily available to motorists in 1955. "We have always viewed the promotion of belt use as a logical complement to an effective drinking driver enforcement effort and our advanced accident problem site identification program," according to the patrol.

"Over the years, we have used most of the traditional promotional techniques: news releases, pamphlets, and safety belt messages printed on some of our motorist contact forms. Recently, we developed two slide presentations that deal specifically with safety belt usage by teenagers and by motorists in general."

The patrol has also worked closely with the Administrative Division of the Ohio Department of Highway Safety in its effective "Saved by the Belt" program, which recognized belt users who have escaped death or serious injury in severe traffic accidents.

Who Does and Who Doesn't?

Overall, their programs have been quite successful and have undoubtedly helped to keep Ohio's traffic death rate significantly lower than that of the

nation as a whole. However, there comes a time when a new approach to safety belt promotion is needed. The best way to devise such an approach is to gather detailed information on the attitudes of the people you are attempting to influence. Who wears seat belts and who doesn't, and why? To find out, a series of statewide surveys were conducted.

The surveys were designed to determine belt usage in each of the state's 88 counties. Individual county usage rates were of prime importance because the patrol's public information program is decentralized — every post commander is responsible for the presentation in the counties served by his post. So if the survey uncovered certain negative attitudes toward belt use in a particular county, the post commander could concentrate on overcoming those objections in a public education presentation tailor-made for the local community.

The first survey was conducted in two phases during March and September 1981. These two months were selected so they could see if adverse road conditions influenced usage rates. The survey itself was structured somewhat like other studies which sought to explore the reasons why people choose not to wear their safety belts. These reasons, often called "seat belt myths," are listed here as they were on the survey instrument:

1. Fear of entrapment
2. I would rather be thrown clear
3. Uncomfortable, restrictive
4. Seat belts cause injury
5. I can brace myself for the collision
6. Short trip — seat belts not necessary
7. I am a careful driver
8. Other

Low Use for Risk Group

This 1981 survey took note of the type of motorist contact (arrest, accident, motor vehicle inspection, etc.) to determine if the safety belt usage rate was significantly lower for drivers who had been stopped for hazardous moving violations, that small segment of our driving population called the "high risk group."

During this first seat belt survey, Ohio state troopers observed 42,105 vehicle occupants to see if they were wearing their restraints. To their surprise, 9,731 drivers and passengers had their safety belts fastened. These observations produced a usage rate of 22.3 percent, far greater than the accepted national average. For the record, a restraint was deemed to be in use only when a trooper observed an occupant who was properly restrained. Only those involved in accidents were asked, "Were you wearing your seat belt?"

Usage rates were highest among persons who required assistance from officers, such as disabled motorists or drivers asking directions. Twenty-seven percent of the people we helped had their belts on.

The next higher usage rate 23.3 percent was for occupants in vehicles detected commiting a traffic violation, while the lowest rate was for those people who had become involved in an accident — only 16.4 percent. Not too surprisingly, the usage rate climbed to 21.2 percent for those who had been involved in a prior accident. A far greater percentage of people used their belts in March (25.5 percent) than they did in September (19.5 percent).

Table 1
Restraint Use vs. Fatalities by Highway Class

Highway Class	*Restraint Usage*	*Percentage of Fatal Accidents*
Turnpike (Toll Road)	29%	1%
Interstate	25%	5%
U.S. Routes	17%	17%
State Routes	17%	37%
County Roads	13%	40%

Most of the vehicle occupants questioned said they didn't wear their seat belts because they were uncomfortable. One person in three cited discomfort as their primary objection to belt usage, and over half of the "other" responses were variations of the uncomfortable-restrictive reply. For example, a great number did not like the pressure applied by the shoulder harness. In the view of many, it "wrinkled clothes," "made me feel tied down" or "got in the way." These "other" responses pushed the uncomfortable or restrictive replies to well over 50 percent of the survey total.

"People do use their seat belts more on the weekends. But they also use them more frequently on the safer superhighways than on the far more dangerous secondary highway systems."

The only other significant response was provided by 17.3 percent of the interviewees who said they did not bother to

(Continued on page 42)

Ohio Belt Use Surveys

(Continued from page 39)

use their belts on short trips. Affirmative responses to the other questions — pertaining to fear of entrapment, a personal preference to be thrown clear, or superior driving skill — were minimal. In fact, these responses were so few that it was no longer felt that it was necessary to refute these particular myths in public information presentations. Instead, the patrol decided to focus their promotions on comfort vs. responsible behavior and the need to use restraints on those short trips during which people mistakenly feel they are safe from death or injury in traffic accidents.

Table 2
Restraint Use vs. Fatalities by Day of Week

Day	*Restraint Usage*	*Percentage of Fatal Accidents*
Sunday	23%	16%
Monday	22%	9%
Tuesday	20%	11%
Wednesday	18%	11%
Thursday	19%	14%
Friday	17%	18%
Saturday	22%	21%

The second survey, conducted in September 1982, was much like the first one. The patrol wanted to validate the high usage rate discovered in 1981, once again nonusers were asked why they did not take advantage of the benefits afforded by safety belts. This time, however, the "other" response from the attitude survey was removed. They found that the vast majority of the responses in the "other" category pertained to seat belt comfort or were too vague to classify properly.

The second survey contained two additional items that provided some interesting information about belt usage by highway classification (primary, secondary, etc.) and by day of the week. Here the patrol wanted to find out if the type of highway positively influenced people to wear their restraints and if people were more inclined to buckle up on the weekends because of the increased likelihood of an accident during these periods of peak travel.

In 1982, the number of occupants surveyed climbed to 64,187 while the usage rate slipped a little to 20.0 percent. Once again, over half of those people questioned (55.8 percent) didn't wear their belts because they thought they were restrictive, wrinkled their clothes, or limited their movements. Another 22.7 percent failed to fasten their restraints when they embarked on a short trip.

The balance of our 1982 survey had, as the old saying goes, "Some good news and some bad news." People do use their seat belts more on the weekends. But they also use them more frequently on the safer superhighways than on the far more dangerous secondary highway systems. In fact, the usage rates by highway were inversely related to the fatal accident experience on that type of highway. We can only conclude that people "buckle up" on the superhighways because they feel less secure at the higher speeds. They fail to wear their belts on short trips over local highways because they are familiar with the roads and probably drive at slower speeds. **Table 1** shows the best usage breakdown by highway type compared to fatal accident experience.

"We can only speculate as to what the usage rate during these local trips would be if so many people did not perceive the seat belt as being uncomfortable and intolerably inconvenient," says the patrol.

The good news of this second survey was that usage was highest on weekends, when fatal accidents are most likely to occur. So the usage rates were somewhat more in line with our fatal accident experience by day of the week. **Table 2** shows the usage breakdown by days of the week compared to fatal accident experience.

Comfort Before Safety

This second survey validated the findings of the first poll. Again, a majority of motorists placed personal comfort before personal safety. The seat belt promotions following this survey asked the driver to act responsibly by making an honest effort to get accustomed to his seat belt and to set a good example for the other occupants of the vehicle. This reaffirmed their previous contention that most accidents occur close to home and that seat belts should be used on those so-called short trips.

The third survey in 1983 generated more public and media interest than the previous two. In this opinion poll, the question of a mandatory seat belt law and two other controversial issues were raised: our newly-enacted child restraint law and the state's recently repealed

motorcycle helmet law. The questions asked were:

1. Do you usually wear your seat belt?
2. Do you favor a mandatory seat belt law?
3. Do you favor the child restraint law?
4. Would you obey a mandatory seat belt law?
5. Do you favor a motorcycle helmet law?

There were between 55,000 and 67,000 responses to these questions. The variation was due to the considerable number of people who had not made up their minds about certain questions and declined to answer. This reluctance to reply was most evident when people were asked if they favored a mandatory seat belt law.

All three issues pertaining to motorist safety were favored by a majority of those who participated in our survey. An overwhelming 95 percent of those questioned favored the child restraint law, while 88 percent said they would like to see a motorcycle helmet law back on the books. The results were less decisive in the matter of a mandatory belt law, but 56.5 percent of those who had an opinion favored this law. Not surprisingly though, almost 89 percent said they would obey the law if one were enacted.

Feminine Support

Women in every age group were more inclined to favor seat belt, child restraint, and motorcycle helmet laws than were men. Almost two-thirds of those women interviewed favored a mandatory belt law. Without feminine support, there would not have been a favorable majority response to the mandatory seat belt law question.

In only one area did men provide more positive responses than did women. A slightly larger percentage of men (37.9 percent) said they usually wore their seat belts, while only 36.5 percent of the women said they did. Incidentally, the observed statewide usage rate this time was 18.5 percent, about one-half of the declared rate of use.

An incident benefit of this survey was that the patrol did not have to develop a new strategy or promotional theme. The results of the survey were sufficient in themselves to generate a great deal of public and editorial comment. Most of it was favorable.

The 1984 survey was designed to see if seat belt usage varied according to car size. Was use higher in the smaller car which affords less protection in a crash? This survey also looked at use by position in the vehicle to determine if belts were used more or less frequently in the most hazardous positions within the vehicle; i.e., behind the wheel and in the right front seat.

Table 3
Restraint Use by Vehicle Type

Vehicle Type	*Usage Rate*
Subcompact	25%
Compact	23%
Intermediate	19%
Full Size	18%
Vans	17%
Trucks (large)	17%
Pickup Trucks	9%

This survey was by far the largest. Ohio state troopers were able to make over 136,000 observations of seat belt use during the month of October. The usage rate among all vehicle occupants was 19 percent. In addition, 75 percent of the children who were required by law to be secured were in a safety seat or seat belt.

As expected, seat belt use in small cars was considerably higher than in larger passenger vehicles. **Table 3** shows the breakdown of belt use by car size.

Perhaps, people do feel less secure in a small car and are therefore motivated to wear their seat belts more often.

"Seat belt use in small cars was considerably higher than in larger passenger vehicles. People do feel less secure in a small car and are, therefore, motivated to wear their seat belts more often."

There was no meaningful differences in seat belt usage by position within the vehicle. The variance in use by position rarely exceeded a percentage point or two. The usage rate was almost invariably lowest for the driver but, the difference was always very slight.

The most valuable information to come from this survey showed that belt usage in pickup trucks averaged only 9 percent. This was the lowest rate found in the survey — even surpassed by large trucks in which 17 percent of the occupants were properly restrained.

In summary, the Ohio State Highway Patrol has been able to keep its seat belt

(Continued on page 50)

Ohio Belt Use Surveys

(Continued from page 43)

program vitally effective through the use of surveys conducted at the scene of their public service contacts with motorist. In the process, they have been able to develop several promotions addressing specific problem areas, and make measurable progress toward the solution of these problems. They have also been able to focus on those segments of the driving population in which seat belt usage is minimal.

One of the principal benefits of this survey program, however, has been the opportunity to personally convey their total commitment to seat belts to over 368,000 motorists. These personal contacts with the public undoubtedly have helped to keep seat belt use in Ohio comparatively high, and have made a positive contribution to traffic safety in Ohio.

Over the past four years the patrol has shared the information obtained in these surveys with dozens of professional and civic organizations who share its objective of promoting the greatest possible use of seat belts. NAFA Members interested in the data obtained from any or all of their surveys are welcome to write to:

Col. Jack Walsh
Ohio State Highway Patrol
660 E. Main Street
Columbus, Ohio 43205

Population Covered By State Seat Belt Use Laws

On July 11, 1984, the U.S. Department of Transportation ruled that if states containing two-thirds of the population enact seat belt use laws by April 1, 1989, installation of automatic ("passive") crash protection devices will not be required in new cars.

According to 1984 Census Bureau estimates, total U.S. population is 237 million, of which 158 million would represent two-thirds. To date, state seat belt use laws in 14 states cover or will cover 39 percent of the population as follows (all figures rounded):

State and date law enacted	Effective date	State Population		Total U.S. Population covered by law	
		Millions	% of U.S.	Millions	%
1. New York (7-12-84)	12-1-84	17.7	7.5	17.7	7.5
2. New Jersey (12-8-84)	3-1-85	7.4	3.1	25.1	10.6
3. Illinois (1-1-85)	7-1-85	11.5	4.9	36.6	15.5
4. Missouri (3-5-85)	9-28-85	4.9	2.1	41.5	17.6
5. Michigan (3-8-85)	7-1-85	9.2	3.9	50.7	21.5
6. New Mexico (4-2-85)	1-1-86	1.4	0.6	52.1	22.1
7. Indiana (4-17-85)	7-1-87	5.5	2.3	57.6	24.4
8. North Carolina (5-23-85)	10-1-85	6.0	2.5	63.6	26.9
9. Oklahoma (6-4-85)	2-1-87	3.2	1.4	85.7	36.2
10. Nebraska (6-5-85)	8-1-85	1.6	0.7	87.3	36.9
11. Hawaii (6-5-85)	12-16-85	1.0	0.4	64.6	27.3
12. Texas (6-16-85)	9-1-85	14.8	6.2	79.4	33.5
13. Connecticut (6-27-85)	1-1-86	3.1	1.3	82.5	34.8
14. Louisiana (7-1-85)	7-1-86	4.4	1.9	91.7	38.8

OMAHA AUTO AUCTION, INC.
7835 "F" Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68127
Auction Telephone: 402 331-9000
Gene VanWinkle, *Flt. Mgr.*
Pick Up and Delivery
Reconditioning Facilities
Thursday 11:30 A.M.

A Subsidiary of
Anglo American Auto Auctions Inc.

MOUNTAIN STATES

COLORADO AUTO AUCTION, INC.
6955 E. 50th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80216
Auction Telephone: 303 287-8077
Van Mankwitz
Bruce Wanker
Pick Up and Delivery: Yes
Reconditioning Facilities: Yes
Tuesday 10:00 A.M.

COLORADO SPRINGS AUTO AUCTION
Exit 132 & I-25
500 Valley Industrial Road
Fountain, Colorado 80817
Auction Telephone: 303 392-3406
Vernie Houtchens
Lynn Houtchens
Pick Up and Delivery: Unlimited
Reconditioning Facilities: Complete
Thursday 12 Noon

DENVER AUTO AUCTION
4285 S. Sante Fe Drive
Englewood, Colorado 80110
Auction Telephone: 303 761-1410
Randy Oosterhoof
Dan Hackett
Pick Up anywhere
Reconditioning Facilities: Complete
Free Storage & Condition Reports
Friday 10:30 A.M.

NEW ENGLAND STATES

CONCORD AUTO AUCTION
Hosmer Street & Route 2
Acton, Massachusetts 01720
Auction Telephone: 617 263-8300
Ed Fahey, *Vice Pres. Oper.*
Tom Caruso, *Flt. Lse. Mgr.*
Judy Jeffrey, *Flt. Secretary*
Arthur Magurn, *Transportation*
Pick Up and Delivery: All NE States
Reconditioning Facilities: Complete
Friday 11:00 A.M.
"Guaranteed Condition Reports"

AMERICAN AUTO AUCTION, INC. A MANHEIM AUCTION
Route 1 & 27
Walpole, Massachusetts 02081
Auction Telephone: 617 668-0799
Carol Sterling, Robert Mowers
Complete Reconditioning
Pick Up Service for New England & New York
Advertising of vehicle through market report and phone solicitation

A6755-1

NAFA
Bulletin
The Magazine for Fleet Administrators
October 1985

1986 ESTIMATED GAS MILEAGE FIGURES

Official Monthly Publication of
The National Association of Fleet Administrators, Inc.
120 Wood Ave. South, Iselin, NJ 08830
Telephone: 201-494-8100

Executive Director
DAVID P. LEFEVER

Associate Executive Director
CELIA P. REA

Director of Communications
LORI A. McDONOUGH

Assistant Editor
PHILLIP E. RUSSO

Legal Counsel
WILLARD H. DaSILVA

NAFA Bulletin

The Magazine for Fleet Administrators
October 1985

Cover design by: Cindi Samol

FEATURES

10 **EPA's 1986 Estimated Gas Mileage Figures**
Here are the EPA mileage rates for all vehicles sold in the United States except California.

16 **183 Attend NAFA's 17th Annual Law Enforcement Conference**
Photos and highlights of the Law Enforcement Seminar/Workshop recently held in Salt Lake City, Utah.

20 **Ford on Imports: Japan's Hold on Market is Tough To Break**
This article is based on a presentation made by Robert Rewey, Vice President and General Manager, Ford Motor Division, at Ford's Annual New Car Show in Las Vegas, Nevada.

28 **Who's Who On the NAFA Staff**
Meet the people who work together to make your Association work for you!

34 **New Car Survey Reveals Purchasing Plans for Public Utility and Government Groups**
Part II of NAFA's New Car Acquisition Survey focuses on what the Public Utility and Government groups plan to do for the 1986 model year.

38 **NAFA's Joe Alacchi Answers Your Most Common Maintenance Questions**
Highlights of Joe Alacchi's presentation at NAFA's Annual Conference in Boston, Massachusetts.

42 **Canadian Members Discuss Their Views on Leasing**
Several of NAFA's Canadian members share their opinions on the pros and cons of leasing.

DEPARTMENTS

6 News Highlights
8 Letters
26 Management
36 New Members and Affiliates
40 Hotline
52 Wholesaler/Broker Directory
53 Directory of Auto Auctions
57 Directory of Fleet Car Dealers

EPA's 1986 Estimated Gas Mileage Figures

MPG Cty	MPG Hwy	Make	Trans-mission	CID	Cyl.
		Sub-Compact Cars			
18	23	Audi Coupe GT	A3	136	5
19	25	Audi Coupe GT	M5	136	5
18	22	Audi 4000CS Quattro	M5	136	5
23	27	Audi 4000S	A3	109	4
25	30	Audi 4000S	M5	109	4
23	32	Chevy Camaro	M5	151	4
19	27	Chevy Camaro	L4	173	6
17	26	Chevy Camaro	M5	173	6
17	25	Chevy Camaro	L4	305	8
16	26	Chevy Camaro	M5	305	8
17	25	Chevy Camaro	L4	305	8
22	28	Chevy Cavalier Cnv	L3	121	4
25	32	Chevy Cavalier Cnv	M4	121	4
24	32	Chevy Cavalier Cnv	M5	121	4
18	25	Chevy Cavalier Cnv	L3	173	6
18	24	Chevy Cavalier Cnv	M4	173	6
25	30	Chevy Chevette CS	L3	98	4
28	34	Chevy Chevette CS	M4	98	4
27	35	Chevy Chevette CS	M5	98	4
40	46	Chevy Chevette CS	D-M5	111	4
31	34	Chevy Spectrum	A3	90	4
38	42	Chevy Spectrum	M5	90	4
41	43	Chevy Sprint Plus	A3	61	3
44	50	Chevy Sprint Plus	M5	61	3
24	27	Chrysler Laser/Daytona	A3	135	4
20	24	Chrysler Laser/Daytona	A3	135	4
19	28	Chrysler Laser/Daytona	M5	135	4
25	35	Chrysler Laser/Daytona	M5	135	4
23	25	Chrysler Laser/Daytona	A3	152	4
23	32	Chrysler Laser/Daytona	M5	152	4
24	27	Chrysler Lebaron Cnv	A3	135	4
20	24	Chrysler Lebaron Cnv	A3	135	4
23	25	Chrysler Lebaron Cnv	A3	152	4
28	33	Dodge Charger	M4	97	4
31	39	Dodge Charger	M4	97	4
24	30	Dodge Charger	A3	135	4
22	30	Dodge Charger	M5	135	4
26	36	Dodge Charger	M5	135	4
20	27	Dodge Charger	M5	135	4
29	32	Dodge Colt	L3	90	4
36	41	Dodge Colt	M4	90	4
33	39	Dodge Colt	M5	90	4
24	26	Dodge Colt	L3	98	4
24	31	Dodge Colt	M5	98	4
19	24	Dodge Conquest	L4	156	4
19	24	Dodge Conquest	M5	156	4
24	27	Dodge Daytona	A3	135	4
20	24	Dodge Daytona	A3	135	4
19	28	Dodge Daytona	M5	135	4
25	35	Dodge Daytona	M5	135	4
23	25	Dodge Daytona	A3	152	4
23	32	Dodge Daytona	M5	152	4
24	27	Dodge 600 Cnv	A3	135	4
20	24	Dodge 600 Cnv	A3	135	4
23	25	Dodge 600 Cnv	A3	152	4
25	30	Ford Laser*	A3	98	4
26	30	Ford Laser*	M4	98	4
21	25	Ford Mustang	A3	140	4
23	28	Ford Mustang	M4	140	4
20	26	Ford Mustang	M5	140	4
19	23	Ford Mustang	L3	231	6
17	25	Ford Mustang	M5	302	8
24	30	Honda Accord	L4	119	4
27	33	Honda Accord	M5	119	4
23	29	Honda Accord	L4	119	4
25	30	Honda Accord	M5	119	4
37	43	Honda Civic	M4	82	4
28	32	Honda Civic	L4	91	4
30	35	Honda Civic	M5	91	4
30	33	Honda Civic	M5	91	4
23	30	Honda Prelude	L4	112	4
24	32	Honda Prelude	M5	112	4
23	29	Honda Prelude	L4	119	4
25	30	Honda Prelude	M5	119	4
31	34	Isuzu I-Mark	A3	90	4
34	40	Isuzu I-Mark	M5	90	4
38	42	Isuzu I-Mark	M5	90	4
22	25	Isuzu Impulse	A4	119	4
22	28	Isuzu Impulse	M5	119	4
20	25	Isuzu Impulse	L4	121	4
20	25	Isuzu Impulse	M5	121	4
13	17	Jaguar XJ-S	A3	326	12
15	19	Jaguar XJ6	A3	258	6
21	25	Lincoln Mercury Capri	A3	140	4
23	28	Lincoln Mercury Capri	M4	140	4
19	23	Lincoln Mercury Capri	L3	231	6
17	25	Lincoln Mercury Capri	M5	302	8
20	23	Merc Benz 190	A4	140	4
21	24	Merc Benz 190	A4	140	4
18	26	Merc Benz 190	M5	140	4
19	27	Merc Benz 190	M5	140	4
30	34	Merc Benz 190	D-A4	152	5
29	37	Merc Benz 190	D-M5	152	5
22	28	Mitsubishi Cordia	M5	110	4
24	26	Mitsubishi Cordia	L3	122	4
25	32	Mitsubishi Cordia	M5	122	4
29	32	Mitsubishi Mirage	L3	90	4
36	41	Mitsubishi Mirage	M4	90	4
33	39	Mitsubishi Mirage	M5	90	4
24	26	Mitsubishi Mirage	L3	98	4
24	31	Mitsubishi Mirage	M5	98	4
19	24	Mitsubishi Starion	L4	156	4
19	24	Mitsubishi Starion	M5	156	4
22	28	Mitsubishi Tredia	M5	110	4
24	26	Mitsubishi Tredia	L3	122	4
24	31	Mitsubishi Tredia	M5	122	4
27	30	Nissan Pulsar NX	L3	98	4
31	38	Nissan Pulsar NX	M5	98	4
27	30	Nissan Sentra	L3	98	4
31	38	Nissan Sentra	M5	98	4
45	50	Nissan Sentra	D-M4	103	4
22	27	Nissan 200 SX	M5	110	4
22	28	Nissan 200 SX	L4	120	4
22	27	Nissan 200 SX	L4	120	4
17	25	Nissan 300 ZX 2+2	L4	181	6
18	26	Nissan 300 ZX 2+2	M5	181	6
29	32	Plymouth Colt	L3	90	4
36	41	Plymouth Colt	M4	90	4
33	39	Plymouth Colt	M5	90	4
24	26	Plymouth Colt	L3	98	4
24	31	Plymouth Colt	M5	98	4
19	24	Plymouth Conquest	L4	156	4
19	24	Plymouth Conquest	M5	156	4
28	33	Plymouth Turismo	M4	97	4
31	39	Plymouth Turismo	M4	97	4
24	30	Plymouth Turismo	A3	135	4
22	30	Plymouth Turismo	M5	135	4
26	35	Plymouth Turismo	M5	135	4
23	32	Pontiac Firebird	M5	151	4
19	27	Pontiac Firebird	L4	173	6
17	26	Pontiac Firebird	M5	173	6
17	25	Pontiac Firebird	L4	305	8
16	26	Pontiac Firebird	M5	305	8
17	25	Pontiac Firebird	L4	305	8

(Continued on page 12)

EPA Gas Mileage Figures

(Continued from page 10)

MPG Cty	MPG Hwy	Make	Trans-mission	CID	Cyl.
41	43	Pontiac Firefly*	A3	61	3
44	50	Pontiac Firefly*	M5	61	3
20	27	Pontiac Sunbird Conv	L3	110	4
24	30	Pontiac Sunbird Conv	L3	110	4
21	28	Pontiac Sunbird Conv	M4	110	4
26	35	Pontiac Sunbird Conv	M5	110	4
25	30	Pontiac 1000	L3	98	4
28	34	Pontiac 1000	M4	98	4
27	34	Pontiac 1000	M5	98	4
21	23	Renault Alliance Cnv	A3	105	4
27	32	Renault Alliance Cnv	M5	105	4
20	24	Renault Fuego	A3	132	4
23	31	Renault Fuego	M5	132	4
8	11	Rolls-Royce Corniche II/Cont	A3	412	8
31	36	Subaru Hatchback	M4	97	4
28	32	Subaru Hatchback	M5	97	4
23	25	Subaru Hatchback	L3	109	4
26	31	Subaru Hatchback	M5	109	4
24	27	Subaru XT	L3	109	4
23	25	Subaru XT	L3	109	4
25	32	Subaru XT	M5	109	4
25	30	Subaru XT	M5	109	4
41	43	Suzuki Forsa V	A3	61	3
44	50	Suzuki Forsa V	M5	61	3
23	29	Toyota Celica	L4	122	4
25	30	Toyota Celica	L4	122	4
25	31	Toyota Celica	M5	122	4
23	29	Toyota Celica	M5	122	4
19	24	Toyota Celica Supra	L4	168	6
18	22	Toyota Celica Supra	M5	168	6
27	33	Toyota Corolla Sport	L4	97	4
28	33	Toyota Corolla Sport	M5	97	4
26	31	Toyota Corolla Sport	M5	97	4
30	32	Toyota Tercel	A3	89	4
35	39	Toyota Tercel	M4	89	4
31	38	Toyota Tercel	M5	89	4
23	25	Volkswagen Scirocco	A3	109	4
24	29	Volkswagen Scirocco	M5	109	4

*Available in Puerto Rico only

Compact Cars

23	29	BMW 5-Series	D-L4	149	6
18	24	BMW 5-Series	L4	164	6
20	24	BMW 5-Series	M5	164	6
24	31	Buick Skyhawk	L3	110	4
20	27	Buick Skyhawk	L3	110	4
21	28	Buick Skylark	M4	110	4
27	37	Buick Skylark	M5	110	4
23	29	Buick Skylark	L3	121	4
25	32	Buick Skylark	M4	121	4
23	32	Buick Somerset/Skylark	L3	151	4
23	34	Buick Somerset/Skylark	M5	151	4
19	27	Buick Somerset/Skylark	L3	181	6
22	27	Cadillac Cimarron	L3	121	4
24	32	Cadillac Cimarron	M5	121	4
18	25	Cadillac Cimarron	L3	173	6
17	22	Cadillac Cimarron	M4	173	6
23	29	Chevy Cavalier	L3	121	4
26	33	Chevy Cavalier	M4	121	4
24	32	Chevy Cavalier	M5	121	4
19	24	Chevy Cavalier	L3	173	6
19	26	Chevy Cavalier	M4	173	6
28	32	Chevy Nova	L3	97	4
30	37	Chevy Nova	M5	97	4
28	33	Dodge Omni	M4	97	4
31	39	Dodge Omni	M4	97	4
24	29	Dodge Omni	A3	135	4
22	30	Dodge Omni	M5	135	4
26	35	Dodge Omni	M5	135	4

MPG Cty	MPG Hwy	Make	Trans-mission	CID	Cyl.
20	27	Dodge Omni	M5	135	4
25	30	Ford Escort	A3	113	4
32	41	Ford Escort	M4	113	4
27	34	Ford Escort	M5	113	4
22	28	Ford Escort	A3	113	4
24	33	Ford Escort	M5	113	4
36	43	Ford Escort	D-M5	122	4
41	49	Ford Escort FS	D-M5	122	4
36	44	Ford Tempo	D-M5	122	4
18	22	Ford Thunderbird	A3	140	4
20	26	Ford Thunderbird	M5	140	4
19	26	Ford Thunderbird	A4	231	6
19	23	Ford Thunderbird	L3	231	6
18	22	Linc-Merc Cougar	A3	140	4
20	26	Linc-Merc Cougar	M5	140	4
19	26	Linc-Merc Cougar	A4	231	6
19	23	Linc-Merc Cougar	L3	231	6
25	30	Linc-Merc Lynx	A3	113	4
32	41	Linc-Merc Lynx	M4	113	4
27	34	Linc-Merc Lynx	M5	113	4
22	28	Linc-Merc Lynx	A3	113	4
24	32	Linc-Merc Lynx	M5	113	4
36	43	Linc-Merc Lynx	D-M5	122	4
36	44	Linc-Merc Topaz	D-M5	122	4
25	30	Mazda 323	A3	98	4
26	30	Mazda 323	M4	98	4
28	34	Mazda 323	M5	98	4
24	28	Mazda 626	A3	122	4
22	28	Mazda 626	M5	122	4
26	32	Mazda 626	M5	122	4
18	22	Mer Benz 300E	A4	181	6
18	25	Mer Benz 300E	M5	181	6
14	16	Mer Benz 560SEC	A4	338	8
18	22	Merkur XR4Ti	A3	140	4
19	24	Merkur XR4Ti	M5	140	4
21	26	Mitsubishi Galant	L4	143	4
18	24	Nissan Maxima	L4	181	6
19	26	Nissan Maxima	M5	181	6
23	26	Nissan Stanza	L3	120	4
26	33	Nissan Stanza	M5	120	4
23	32	Olds Calais	L3	151	4
23	34	Olds Calais	M5	151	4
19	27	Olds Calais	L3	181	6
20	27	Olds Firenza	L3	110	4
24	31	Olds Firenza	L3	110	4
21	28	Olds Firenza	M4	110	4
27	37	Olds Firenza	M5	110	4
23	29	Olds Firenza	L3	121	4
25	32	Olds Firenza	M4	121	4
19	24	Olds Firenza	L3	173	6
19	26	Olds Firenza	M4	173	6
20	23	Peugeot 505 Sedan	L4	120	4
20	24	Peugeot 505 Sedan	M5	120	4
19	22	Peugeot 505 Sedan	L4	131	4
19	24	Peugeot 505 Sedan	M5	131	4
28	33	Plymouth Horizon	M4	97	4
31	39	Plymouth Horizon	M4	97	4
24	29	Plymouth Horizon	A3	135	4
26	35	Plymouth Horizon	M5	135	4
23	32	Pontiac Grand Am	L3	151	4
23	34	Pontiac Grand Am	M5	151	4
19	27	Pontiac Grand Am	L3	181	6
24	31	Pontiac Sunbird	L3	110	4
20	27	Pontiac Sunbird	L3	110	4
21	28	Pontiac Sunbird	M4	110	4
27	37	Pontiac Sunbird	M5	110	4
26	30	Renault Alliance/Encore	A3	85	4
32	38	Renault Alliance/Encore	M4	85	4
35	41	Renault Alliance/Encore	M4	85	4
33	39	Renault Alliance/Encore	M5	85	4
24	28	Renault Alliance/Encore	A3	105	4
30	37	Renault Alliance/Encore	M5	105	4
8	11	Rolls Royce Camargue	A3	412	8
19	23	Saab 900	A3	121	4